

Pest Management Regulatory Agency Agricultural Buffer Zone Proposal

Presentation to the
Pest Management Advisory Council
November 2005
Karen Lloyd



Overview

- ▶ Background
- ▶ Proposed approach

Background: Stakeholder Comments

- ▶ No observable adverse effects
- ▶ Perceived to be overprotective
 - ◆ “Too big”
- ▶ Not reflective of “real world”
 - ◆ Area requiring protection
 - ◆ Application methodology

PMRA Perspective

- ▶ One size fits all
- ▶ No flexibility based on:
 - ◆ Adjacent sensitive habitat
 - ◆ Application conditions
- ▶ Doesn't 'credit' drift reducing technologies

Goals

- ▶ Provide flexibility
- ▶ Recognize different habitats
- ▶ Reward efficient application
- ▶ Remain protective

Buffer Zone Proposal

- ▶ Application Specific Variable Buffer Zones
- ▶ Method for applicator to adjust (modify) labelled buffer zone based on:
 - ◆ Sensitive habitat impacted
 - ◆ Application specific variables
 - meteorological conditions
 - sprayer configuration

Sensitive Habitats

- ▶ Aquatic areas
 - ◆ Labelled buffer zone modified based on depth of water
- ▶ Terrestrial areas
 - ◆ No buffer zone modifiers
 - ◆ List of exclusions

Aquatic Sensitive Habitat Modifiers

Depth (m) (estimated average depth)	Multiplier		
	Field	Airblast	Aerial
< 1	1.0	1.0	1.0
1 – 3	0.4	0.7	0.5
> 3	0.2	0.3	0.1

Application Specific Variables

- ▶ Meteorological conditions
- ▶ Sprayer configuration
- ▶ Other

Meteorological Variables

- ▶ Wind speed
- ▶ Atmospheric stability
 - ◆ Labelled
- ▶ Temperature
- ▶ Humidity

Configuration Variables

- ▶ Spray quality
- ▶ Boom height and length
- ▶ Carrier volume
- ▶ Shrouds and cones
- ▶ Sprayer type

Other Variables

- ▶ Travel speed
- ▶ Crop growth stage

Field, Airblast, Chemigation Application Modifiers

- ▶ Obtained by examination of literature
 - ◆ Relationship between variable and drift/deposit

- ▶ Reduced variables to those:
 - ◆ Relevant
 - ◆ Greatest impact

Field Application Variable

- ▶ Meteorological conditions
 - ◆ Wind speed
- ▶ Sprayer configuration
 - ◆ Spray quality (DSD)
 - ◆ Boom height
- ▶ Shrouds and cones

Field Application Modifiers

Low Boom				
Wind Speed (km/h)	Spray Quality			
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Very Coarse
1-8	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.0
9-16	1.2	0.6	0.3	0.1
17-25	1.6	1.0	0.6	0.2
High Boom				
Wind Speed (km/h)	Spray Quality			
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Very Coarse
1-8	1.6	0.3	0.2	0.2
9-16	2.3	1.1	0.6	0.2
17-25	3.1	1.9	1.1	0.4

15



Field Application Modifiers

Low Boom – Drift Reducing Cones				
Wind Speed (km/h)	Spray Quality			
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Very Coarse
1-8	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.0
9-16	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.1
17-25	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.2
Low Boom – Drift Reducing Shrouds				
Wind Speed (km/h)	Spray Quality			
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Very Coarse
1-8	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
9-16	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
17-25	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1

6



Buffer Zone Proposal

- ▶ **Spray drift management** booklet
 - ◆ Buffer zones modifier tables
 - ◆ Best management practices
- ▶ Easier to update
 - ◆ Additional drift reduction modifiers
 - ◆ Advances in spray drift reduction technology

Proposed Procedure

Registration

- ▶ PMRA sets buffer zone using standard scenarios
- ▶ Buffer zone is put on the label

Proposed Procedure

Use

- ▶ Voluntary modification of labelled buffer zone
- ▶ Applicator surveys the area of application
- ▶ Applicator notes meteorological conditions at time of application
- ▶ Applicator notes equipment setup

Proposed Procedure

Use

- ▶ Applicator determines application specific modifiers from tables
- ▶ Labelled buffer zone is adjusted appropriately
- ▶ Details recorded on “Application Record” form

Advantages

- ▶ Provides flexibility
 - ◆ Products can be used in situations where labelled buffer zone is impractical
- ▶ Rewards efficient application
 - ◆ Encourages drift reducing application strategies
- ▶ Amenable to spray technology progress
 - ◆ Proven technologies can be added

Advantages

- ▶ No cost to applicator
 - ◆ Voluntary
 - ◆ Additional equipment not needed

- ▶ Recognizes different habitats
 - ◆ Allowances for various water depths

- ▶ Remains environmentally protective
 - ◆ Modifiers based on empirical data

Future Directions

- ▶ Incorporation of other variables
 - ◆ Low drift nozzles
 - ◆ Leaf area index for orchards
- ▶ Collaboration with other agencies
 - ◆ EPA
 - ◆ Australia

Questions

- ▶ 1. What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the proposed strategy?
- ▶ 2. What issues do you see as key for implementation?
- ▶ 3. Are there any additional approaches that the PMRA should consider to mitigate environmental risk?